

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成18年度
(第10号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2006

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2007・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2007

Bauddhavacana Notes on Buddhist Vocabulary

Jonathan A. SILK

For Akira Yuyama, word collector and much else

This is the first of a projected occasional series of notes on Buddhist vocabulary. The first two items here concern suggested corrections to Edgerton's monumental *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, the third a Sanskrit word unknown to dictionaries, while the remaining two items concern Chinese Buddhist translation vocabulary.

I. *Vemātrī* / *vemātr*

II. **Parikarati*: A ghost word

III. *Vajrāgni*

IV. *Rānbhūi* 染穢 and associated vocabulary

V. Two Chinese Kinship Terms Unknown to Dictionaries: *qīnmèi* 親妹 and *qīnzǐ* 親姊

I. *Vemātrī* / *vemātr*

In the *editio princeps* of the *Mahāvastu* we find the following sentence:¹ *tehi dāni kumārehi mā mo jāti-saṃdoṣaṃ bhaviṣyatīti jāti-saṃdoṣa-bhayena svakasvā yeva mātṛyo bhaginīyo parasparasya vivāhitā*. Edgerton suggested that the manuscript reading *mātṛyo* should be kept, and proposed translating the final portion of the sentence “(the princes) gave to each other in marriage each their own sisters by the same mother (thus avoiding the marriage of any with his own co-uterine sister).”² Other interpretations had already been offered by Senart and Jones. Senart suggested:³ “dans la crainte de compromettre la pureté de leur race, ils épousèrent leurs propres soeurs, chacun en choisissant une d’une autre mère que lui.” Jones translated:⁴ “Those young princes said to themselves: ‘There

¹ Senart 1882-1897: i.351.2-4, reprised on 8-9.

² Edgerton 1953 s.v. *mātrī*. What Edgerton means by “co-uterine” here is “full sister,” that is, having both parents in common, but see below.

³ Senart 1882-1897: 1.625.

must be no corruption in our race.’ And from fear of such a corruption they each married a half-sister born of a different mother.”

The palm-leaf manuscript recently published by Yuyama may assist us here. It reads in this passage and its reprise a few lines below not *svakasukā yeva mātṛyo* but *svakasukā vemātṛyo / vemātṛyo*.⁵ The expression is attested in both Pāli and Sanskrit. In the former we find *vemātika bhāginī* in the *Jātaka*, when the prince Udayabhadda is forced to wed his half-sister Udayabhaddā.⁶

udayabhaddam alaṅkāretvā¹ tassa santike ṭhapesum | sā tam suvaṇṇarūpakam²
abhibhavitvā aṭṭhāsi | atha nesam³ anicchamānānam nēva vemātikam bhāginim⁴
udayabhaddakumārim aggamaheṣim katvā bodhisattam rajjam abhisinācimsu | te pana
dve pi brahmacariyavāsam eva vasiṃsu | ... ubho ekagabbhe vasamānā⁵ pi lobhavasena
indriyāni bhinditvā aññamaññam na olokesum |

1) PTS: alaṅkaritvā 2) PTS: suvaṇṇarūpam 3) PTS: tesam 4) PTS: vemātikabhāginim 5) PTS
vasamanā

Adorning Udayabaddhā, they set her in his presence, and she stood there outshining that golden image. Then even against the couple’s wishes they made his agnatic half-sister the princess Udayabhaddā his principal consort, and anointed the bodhisatta [that is, Prince Udayabhadda] in the rulership. But the two of them lived together in perfect celibacy. ... Even though both were living in a single chamber, mastering their senses they did not look upon each other with desire.

In Sanskrit, in the same story as that in the *Mahāvastu*, the tale of the origins of the Śākya clan,⁷ we find the sage Kapila instructing the sons of King Virūdhaka Īkṣvāku, *svakasvakā bhāginīs tyaktvā vaimātṛkābhir bhāginībhiḥ sārddham vāsam kalpayata*, “Avoiding your full sisters, cohabit with your agnatic half-sisters.”⁸

In light of the new manuscript evidence, we obtain an understandable text which, moreover, has the virtue of presenting a vocabulary item attested also in Pāli and Sanskrit. I therefore believe that the passage should be understood as follows: “Those princes said: ‘There must be no corruption of our lineage.’ And out of fear of corruption of the lineage, they gave to each other in marriage their own agnatic half-sisters.”⁹ With the

⁴ Jones 1949-1956: 1.296, with n. 3.

⁵ Yuyama 2001: 55, plate of folio 108b3, 4.

⁶ *Jātaka* 458 (Udaya). Fausbøll 1877-1896: iv.105,9-16 = Burmese Sixth Council edition (Dhammagiri-Pāli-Gaṇṭhamālā 73 [Dhammagiri, Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1998]): 94.9-14.

⁷ See Silk Forthcoming.

⁸ *Samghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, edited in Gnoli 1977: 29.28-29.

⁹ Perhaps the *yeva* of Senart’s edition represents a scribal attempt to compensate for a mis-understood *ve*, or even *va*, which stood here in some archetype.

exception of the fact that they seem to gloss over the causative nature of the participle *vivāhita*, the translations of both Senart and Jones appear to be quite correct, grasping the true meaning in spite of the corrupt readings before them.

I do not, I confess, entirely understand Edgerton's rendering, but he too may be after the same thing. Based, however, on his wrong assumption concerning **mātrī*, his "by the same mother" cannot be accepted. The correct meaning of *vemātrī/vemātṛ* is "agnatic half-sister," that is half-sister with a common father but different mothers. The entry for "mātrī" in Edgerton's dictionary should, correspondingly, be deleted, and a new lemma for **vemātrī* / *vemātṛ* entered, with reference to the standard Sanskrit and Pāli forms of the word.

II. **Parikarati*: A ghost word

The *Pūrṇāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna* contains the following:¹⁰

āyusmān mahāmaudgalyāyanaḥ saṁlakṣayati | pūrvam uktaṁ bhagavatā
duṣkarakārakau hi bhikṣavaḥ putrasya mātāpitarāv āpyāyakau poṣakau saṁvardhakau
stanyasya dātārau citrasya jambudvīpasya darśayitārau | ekenāṁśena putro mātaraṁ
dviṭīyena pitaraṁ pūrṇavarṣaśataṁ parikared yad vāsyāṁ mahāpṛthivyāṁ maṇayo
muktā vaidūryaśaṅkhaśilāpravāḍaṁ rajataṁ jātārūpam aśmagarbho musāragalvo
lohitikā dakṣiṇāvarta ity evaṁrūpe vā vividhaiśvaryādhipatyē pratiṣṭhāpayan neyatā
putreṇa mātāpitaroḥ kṛtaṁ vā syād upakṛtaṁ vā | yas tv aśv aśrāddhaṁ mātāpitaraṁ
śraddhāsaṁpadi samādāpayati vinayati niveśayati pratiṣṭhāpayati duḥśīlaṁ śīlasaṁpadi
matsariṇaṁ tyāgasāṁpadi duṣprajñaṁ prajñāsaṁpadi samādāpayati vinayati niveśayati
pratiṣṭhāpayati iyatā putreṇa mātāpitroḥ kṛtaṁ vā syād upakṛtaṁ veti |

The verb printed in the *editio princeps* as *parikaret* is discussed by Edgerton.¹¹ Under the lemma "parikarati" he took the word as "possibly denom. to Skt. parikara," and identified it with Pāli *parikarati*, saying "cited °karoti by PTSD, but all its citations fit the stem in -a-." He then offered the definition "aids, serves, waits upon." I suggest rather that we conjecturally emend very slightly to **parikarṣet*, as a form of *parikarṣati* (or *parikarṣayati*), "carry around." This suggestion is supported by Chinese *dān* 担, and probably, although less certainly, by Tibetan *bzbag*, the terms we find in the corresponding passages in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* Vinaya from which the *Divyāvadāna* drew its account. Interestingly, this understanding was already adopted by Burnouf,¹² who translated from

¹⁰ Cowell and Neil 1886: 51.18-52.3. The text is found in Tibetan (Derge Kanjur 1, 'dul ba, kba, 5b1ff) and Chinese (T. 1448 [XXIV] 16a18ff [juan 4]) as well. The text was translated by Burnouf 1844: 270f; compare also Tatelman 2000: 77ff. The Chinese translation was translated into Japanese by Iwamoto 1968: 172ff.

¹¹ Edgerton 1953 s.v. parikarati.

manuscripts, working decades before the publication of the first edition. Burnouf's manuscripts were not made use of by the editors, however, and we cannot know precisely how he read the word. There are, however, some complications.

In a passage in the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* we find the duty a child owes his parents expressed as follows: *ekena bhikkhave amsena mātaraṃ parihareyya ekena amsena pitaraṃ parihareyya* ..., "if, monks, one were to carry his mother around on one shoulder and his father around on the other ...," the text going on to say that even centuries of this and other sorts of good treatment would not repay the debt.¹³ The verb here, *parihareyya*, is, of course, the optative of *pariharati*, which also exists as such in Buddhist Sanskrit. Although Edgerton defines it (s.v.) as "protects, guards, looks after," he in fact cites a passage perfectly parallel to the Pāli *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* example, this from the *Avadānaśataka*: *ya ekenāmsena putro mātaraṃ dvitīyena pitaraṃ pūrṇaṃ varṣasataṃ parihareyyad vā*¹⁴ The Pāli commentary to the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, the *Manorathapūraṇī*,¹⁵ explains the usage as follows: *ekena bhikkhave amsena mātaraṃ parihareyyā ti ekasmim amsakūṭe thapetvā mātaraṃ paṭijaggeyya*, "the expression 'if, monks, one were to carry his mother around on one shoulder' means 'if one were to carry his mother having placed her on his shoulder.'" Here the verb *parihareyyā* is glossed as *paṭijaggeyya*, the present indicative of which is *paṭijaggati*, Buddhist Sanskrit *pratijāgati*.¹⁶

From another point of view, regarding the Tibetan equivalent of the postulated **parikarṣet*, in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* the expression *cailonḍukam iva śirasā parikarṣeḥ* ("should carry him around on his head like a turban") is rendered in Tibetan with *mgo la thod bzbin du thogs shing*, in which *thogs* rather than *bzbag* is found.¹⁷ (The meaning is confirmed by the commentary, which glosses *dhārayeḥ*.¹⁸) In the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, *parikarṣaṇa* is translated *yongs su brungs ba*,¹⁹ in which the idea of protection is emphasized. While there is no necessary reason we should expect consistency in the Tibetan translations of the Indic word, the term may well benefit from further study.

In sum, I propose as a translation of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* passage the following:

The Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāyana thought to himself: "Previously the Blessed

¹² Burnouf 1844: 270: "Supposons, d'un côté, un fils qui passe cent années entières à porter sa mère sur ses épaules. ..."

¹³ Morris and Hardy 1885-1900: i.61,30-62,1 (II.4.2).

¹⁴ Speyer 1906-1909: 1.205, 1-2 (Maitrakanyaka).

¹⁵ Burmese Sixth Council edition, Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganthamālā 42 (Dhammagiri, Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1995) 20.7-8.

¹⁶ Noriyuki Kudo, in preparing this paper for the press, kindly brought to my attention the following expression in the *Karmavibhaṅga* (Kudo 2004: 122.2 = 123.2): *yo bhikkhavo mātāpitaraṃ/pitarau skandbena grhya* ..., as well as his note 39 (pp. 264-265), which also provides examples of parallels in Chinese to the expression "carrying one's parents on one's shoulders."

¹⁷ Wogihara 1932-1935: 943.15-16 = Derge Kanjur 12, *sbes phyin brgyad stong pa, ka*, 267b7.

¹⁸ Wogihara 1932-1935: 961.7.

¹⁹ Hirakawa et al. 1973: 226.

One said: ‘Mother and father, monks, do what is difficult for a son, they are nurturers, nourishers, fosterers, givers of milk, teachers of multifarious ways of the world. Should a son carry his mother on one shoulder and his father on the other for a full hundred years, or were he to establish them in any variety of wealth or sovereignty [giving them] all the jewels, pearls, lapis lazuli, coral, conches, gems, gold, silver, emerald, sapphire, ruby, and right spiral conch of the whole earth,²⁰ such a son would not do anything for his parents nor would he benefit them. But one who instigates, guides, directs to and establishes his unbelieving parents in the wealth of faith, or instigates, guides, directs to and establishes [parents] who are ill-behaved in the wealth of good behavior, selfish [parents] in the wealth of renunciation, ignorant [parents] in the wealth of wisdom, such a son would do something for his parents, he would benefit them.’

III. *Vajrāgni*

The word *vajrāgni* is not defined in Sanskrit dictionaries known to me,²¹ but occurs twice in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*.²² However, the word is far from unknown, appearing already in the *Mahābhārata*.²³ A number of other Sanskrit examples were brought to my attention by Harunaga Isaacson, whose note I quote here, before going on to discuss a passage in which an alternative interpretation seems more likely.

In the *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghōṣa, in describing Nanda’s wife Sundarī when Nanda has left to follow the Buddha and has not returned as promised, the poet says of her *sā sundarī tvāsacalodarī hi vajrāgnisambhinnaḍarī guheva*, which Johnston translates “For Sundarī, with her bosom straining with sobs like a cave whose opening has been split by the fiery thunderbolt.”²⁴ In the ‘Ur’-*Skandapurāṇa*, concerning a member of Śiva’s army, Viṭpati, releasing an arrow against Vṛtra, we find (141.3cd): *mumoca vajrāgnisamāṇṇ ripukṣayakaram śaram*. A verse from the *Mokṣopāya* (vairāgyaprakaraṇa 16.47) reads:

nāsidhūrā na vajrāgnir na taptāyaḥkaṇārciṣaḥ |

tathā tīkṣṇā yathā brahmanis tṛṣṇeyam hydi saṁsthitā | |

Finally, in Bhavabhūti’s *Mahāvīracarita* 3.21d we find *vajrāgnir drumam iva bhasmasātkaromi* (where the object of *bhasmasātkaromi* is *ātatāyinam* in pāda b).

In the context of an email discussion of this word, which prompted Isaacson’s kind contribution, Arlo Griffiths pointed to a passage in the *Divyāvadāna*’s *Kuṇālāvadāna*,²⁵ in

²⁰ My translation of the list of precious substances here makes no attempt to determine the exact identification of each item, if indeed this is even possible.

²¹ See however Turner 1966: 653b, who cites the Old Awadhī word *bajāgi*, “fire caused by lightening.” It is also listed but not defined by Wogihara 1964-1974: *69b.

²² Johnston 1950: 118.18, 106.3.

²³ Critical edition 8.12.52c. I owe my knowledge of this to Arthur Karp (email 11 Mar. 2004).

²⁴ *Saundarananda* 6.33ab, Johnston 1928: 40, 1932: 33-34.

which we have the half-verse: *na sastravajrāgniviṣāṇi pannagāḥ kurvanti pīḍāṃ nabhaso 'vikāriṇaḥ*.²⁶ Although in all the examples cited above *vajrāgni* appears to be a single word, it is questionable whether that is the case here. Hertel took it as two words,²⁷ which is also the understanding of a Chinese version of the same text (非刀劍害、亦非金剛、非火、非毒、非怨惡惡蛇),²⁸ translated by Przyluski:²⁹ “Ce n’est pas le glaive qui blesse; ce n’est pas non plus la foudre ni le feu, ni le poison, ni le serpent hostile et cruel.” The Tibetan translation of the *Kuṇālāvadāna* has something different:³⁰ *mtshon dang rdo rje dug dang sbrul rnams kyis || nam mkha’ ’gyur zhing gnod byed mi nus so ||*. Here *mtshon* = *sastra*, *rdo rje* = *varja(agni)* and *dug* = *viṣa*. The translators appear to have skipped *agni*, unless they considered the compound identical in meaning with *varja* alone. In this *Kuṇālāvadāna* passage, then, *vajrāgni* seems to be a *dvandva*. Any future dictionary should, therefore, list both possibilities, giving both the meanings “thunderbolt” and “cudgel and fire” (or some such).

IV. *Rānbui* 染穢 and associated vocabulary

We find a striking sentence in the **Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā*, narrating the story of Mahādeva:³¹ 其子長大、染穢於母, “The son had grown up and defiled his mother.” Here the verb *rānbui* 染穢, to defile, has mother, *mū* 母, as its direct object, a relation which is clearly marked by *yú* 於. The word *rānbui* 染穢 is relatively rare (as is its inversion, *buirān* 穢染). When *rānbui* 染穢 is used in the Chinese *Dirghāgama*, the expression *yóu bǐ rānbuixiāng* 由彼染穢想 is equivalent to *apariyositasamkappa* in the Pāli version,³² a word which the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* defines as “whose aspirations are unsatisfied.”³³ Okayama,³⁴ however, suggests that the Chinese means simply “defiled” (*kegaré*), and he translates the line “*kano kegareshi omoi ni yorite*,”³⁵ “through that defiled thought.” The latter sense is to be noticed more in the equivalence in Narendrayāśas’s translation of the *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, where in verse 10 of the first chapter we find 無染穢心趣佛道 for what in Sanskrit reads *asamkliṣṭena cittena buddhajñānam gaveṣate*,³⁶ “to

²⁵ Via email 12 Mar. 2004.

²⁶ Cowell & Neil 1886: 416.20 = Mukhopadhyaya 1963: 121.3. The same verse with the same reading is also found in the *Aśokāvadānamālā*, Bongard-Levin and Volkova 1965, verse 261. There is no equivalent in chapter 59 of Kṣemendra’s *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*.

²⁷ Hertel 1908: 263.

²⁸ T. 2042 (L) 109c23-24 (*juan* 3).

²⁹ Przyluski 1923: 292.

³⁰ Derge Tanjur 4145, ’*dul ba*, su 237b2.

³¹ T. 1545 (XXVII) 510c27 (*juan* 99).

³² T. 1 (14) (I) 65b11 (*juan* 10), Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1890-1911: ii.287,7 (21.2.9).

³³ Trenckner et al. 1924- s.v.

³⁴ Okayama et al. 2000: 300, n. 140.

³⁵ Okayama et al. 2000: 147.

strive after the wisdom of a buddha with undefiled mind.” A sense of disgust is more strongly brought out in a verse from the same *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, *kāmānaṃ kāraṇaṃ bālāḥ striyaṃ sevanti pūtikām | pūtikām gati gacchanti patante [te]na durgatim ||*,³⁷ “Fools driven by lusts attend on putrid women. They go on the path of those putrid [women], and through that fall into evil destinies [after death].” This is quoted in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* as follows:³⁸ 愚者耽著諸欲事 親近女人染穢身 還當向彼染穢中 隨業墮在諸惡趣. We might conclude from this that, first, we cannot with any confidence suggest a good Sanskrit equivalent for *rānbui* 染穢, and second, that it certainly appears to be used euphemistically, in perhaps something close to the same sense that is conveyed in English by the expression “he defiled her.” It is interesting that it is only the example from the **Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* which uses *rānbui* 染穢 as a verb.

Although no direct connection between the words can be established, we should note that Sanskrit *dūṣaṇa* appears in something very much like the same meaning.³⁹ In addition to Buddhist examples, see for instance the *Mahābhārata* verse (1.57.61-62): *tvasamyogāt ca duṣyeta kanyābhāvo || kanyātve dūṣite cāpi katham śaksye dvijottama |*, where the reference is to the violation of virginity.

V. Two Chinese Kinship Terms Unknown to Dictionaries: *qīnmèi* 親妹 and *qīnzī* 親姊

The term *qīnmèi* 親妹 is not recorded in the *Hanyu Dacidian*, and taken by Morohashi as a modern word, defined as “elder sister.”⁴⁰ However, the word is used several times by the Zhou-Tang period translator Yijing, in contexts in which it seems to mean only sister(s) in general, either specifically full sister, or generically sister. In a *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Vinayakṣudrakavastu* passage the expression *de dag gis der rang rang gi sring mo btang ste | mas dben gyi sring mo rnamis dang lban cig 'tsho gnas 'khod do* is paralleled in Chinese with 遂捨親妹取異母者.⁴¹ Here *qīnmèi* 親妹 clearly corresponds to *rang rang gi sring mo*, an established translation of Sanskrit *svakasvakā bhaginīḥ*. The correspondence, however, need not always be so strict. In the *Pravrajyāvastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* we find the expression *'di ni kho bo'i chung ma ma yin gyi | 'di ni kho bo'i sring mo yin no ||*, to which corresponds Chinese 此非我妻、是親妹也.⁴² Here *qīnmèi* 親妹

³⁶ T. 639 (XV) 549b10 (*juan* 1); Matsunami 1975: 229.1 = Dutt 1939-1959: ii.1.13,8.

³⁷ Dutt 1939-1959: ii.2.414,1-2.

³⁸ T. 1635 (XXXII) 58a4-5 (*juan* 4).

³⁹ On the verb $\sqrt{dus}$ in legal literature, which sometimes plays on the dual sense of defiling and defaming, see Hopkins 1925: 41-42 (e.g., *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* 1.66cd: *aduṣṭāṃ ca tyajan kanyāṃ dūṣayāṃs tu mṛṣā śatam*). Note, incidentally, the Latin usage of *stuprare*, “to debauch or ravish,” in descriptions of incest, mentioned by Archibald 2001: xiii.

⁴⁰ Morohashi 1955-1960: 10.334d (34918.88).

⁴¹ Derge Kanjur, 'dul ba, da 202a6-7 = T. 1451 (XXIV) 379a23-24 (*juan* 34).

⁴² Derge Kanjur 1, 'dul ba, ka 41a7, critically edited in Eimer 1983: 108.17-18 = T. 1444 (XXIII) 1029a7 (*juan* 2).

corresponds simply to *sring mo*, sister.

The certainly related *qīnzī* 親妹, as far as I know not recorded at all in dictionaries, appears to be equally rare, if not rarer. I have found it only in a tenth century translation of Faxian,⁴³ and in an eighth-century translation of Bodhiruci.⁴⁴ In the latter case, the correspondence of the expression as a whole, however, is not clear to me.⁴⁵

Both kinship terms should be entered in future comprehensive dictionaries of Chinese.

Literature

- Archibald, Elizabeth. 2001. *Incest and the Medieval Imagination* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Bongard-Levin, Gregory M., and O. F. Volkova. 1965. *The Kunala Legend and an Unpublished Asokavadanamala Manuscript* (Calcutta: Indian Studies Past and Present).
- Burnouf, Eugène. 1844. *Introduction à l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien* (Paris: Imprimerie Royal).
- Cowell, Edward Byles, and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1939-1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts* (Srinagar and Calcutta: J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press.). Four volumes in nine parts.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Eimer, Helmut. 1983. *Rab Tu 'Byuñ Ba'i Gzi*. Asiatische Forschungen 82 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz). 2 volumes.
- Fausbøll, Michel Viggo. 1877-1896. *The Jātaka, Together with its Commentary* (London: Trübner & Co.).
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sanghabbedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 49/1 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- Hertel, Johannes. 1908. *Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hēmacandras Parīṣiṣṭaparvan*. Bibliothek morgenländischer Erzähler 1 (Leipzig: Wilhelm Heims).
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, et al. 1973. *Index to the Abhidharmakośabbāṣya (P. Pradban Edition). Part One: Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese* (Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan).
- Hopkins, E[dward] Washburn. 1925. "Words of Defamation in Sanskrit Legal Language." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45: 39-50.
- Iwamoto Yutaka 岩本裕. 1968. *Mokuren Densetsu to Urabon* 目連傳説と盂蘭盆. Bukkyō Setsuwa Kenkyū 佛教説話研究 3 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館).
- Johnston, E[dward] H[amilton]. 1928, 1932. *The Saundarananda of Aśvaghoṣa* (London; Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975).
- . 1950. *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* (Patna: Bihar Research Society).
- Jones, J[ohn] J[ames]. 1949-1956. *The Mahāvastu* (Reprint: London: Pali Text Society, 1973-1978).
- Kudo, Noriyuki. 2004. *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VII. (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology).
- Matsunami Seiren 松濤誠廉. 1975. "Bonbun Gattō Zanmaikyō" 梵文月灯三昧經 [The Samādbirājasūtra]. *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 60: 244-188; 61: 796-761.

⁴³ T. 191 (III) 937b1 (*juan* 2).

⁴⁴ T. 1092 (XX) 252c14 (*juan* 5).

⁴⁵ Derge Kanjur 686, *rgyud 'bum*, *ma*, 39b6-7: *sring mo zbes bgyi bas ni dgos pa'i yo byad thams cad tshang bar stobs par 'gyur zhing yan lag sbong bar bgyid do* ||, T. 1092 (XX) 252c14-15 (*juan* 5): 若乞龍女為親姊者。宮中寶具衣服甘露飲食亦盡賞賜。

- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955-1960. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典 (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店) . 13 volumes.
- Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1963. *The Aśokāvadāna: Sanskrit Text Compared with Chinese Versions* (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi).
- Morris, Richard, and Edmund Hardy. 1885-1900. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*. Second Edition, revised by A. K. Warder (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint: 1961).
- Okayama Hajime 丘山新, Kamitsuka Yoshiko 神塚淑子, Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志, Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史, Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, Hikita Hiromichi 引田弘道, and Matsumura Takumi 松村巧. 2000. *Gendaigoyaku Agon Kyōten: Jōagonkyō Dai-sankan* 現代語訳阿含經典 長阿含經 3 卷 (Tokyo: Hirakawa shuppansha 平河出版社).
- Przyluski, Jean. 1923. *La Légende de l'Empereur Aśoka*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études 31 (Paris: Paul Geuthner).
- Rhys Davids, T[homas] W[illiam], and J[oseph] Estlin Carpenter. 1890-1911. *The Dīgha Nikāya* (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1975).
- Senart, Émile Charles Marie. 1882-1897. *Le Mahāvastu*. Société Asiatique, Collection d'Ouvrages Orientaux, Seconde Série (Paris: Imprimerie National; Reprint: Tokyo: Meicho Fukyūkai, 1977).
- Silk, Jonathan A. Forthcoming. "Incestuous Ancestries: On the Family Origins of Gautama Siddhārtha, Interpretations of Genesis 20.12, and the Status of Scripture in Buddhism." To appear in *History of Religions*.
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1906-1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint The Hague: Mouton, 1958).
- Tatelman, Joel. 2000. *The Glorious Deeds of Pūrṇa: A Translation and Study of the Pūrṇāvadāna* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press).
- Trenckner, Vilhelm, et al. 1924-. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy).
- Turner, R[alph] L[jilly]. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來. 1932-1935. *Abhisamayālamkāraḥ Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1973).
- . 1964-1974. *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 [A Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary with Chinese equivalents] (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation).
- Yuyama, Akira. 2001. *The Mahāvastu-Avadāna: In Old Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts*. I. Palm-Leaf Manuscripts. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 15 (Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco/ The Toyo Bunko). [Actually published 2003.]

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成19年度
(第11号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2007

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2008・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2008

*Parikarṣati Reconsidered

Jonathan A. SILK

In the previous issue of this journal,¹ I published a note in which I suggested a small change to the text of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna*, namely that the *hapax legomenon* printed in the *editio princeps* as *parikared* be read **parikarṣed*, in the expression *ekenāṁśena putro mātaraṁ dvitīyena pitaraṁ pūrṇavarṣaśataṁ *parikarṣed*, “Should a son carry his mother on one shoulder and his father on the other for a full hundred years.”² It should be noted at the outset that there is no question about the meaning of the phrase: it is a metaphorical expression signaling supreme respect for parents. The proper verb in the *Pūrṇāvadāna*, however, being unclear, I essayed a note. When preparing that note, although I paid attention to parallel expressions with the verb *pari√hr*, I overlooked the fact that already in 1902 J. S. Speyer, and some 48 years later but without reference to Speyer likewise D. R. Shackleton Bailey, had noticed the problem, both suggesting instead that one read *parihared*. Speyer wrote confidently as follows:³

[A]n indispensable correction may be made with the aid of the transmitted text of the *Avadānaśataka*. Tale nr. 36 of that collection ... contains the same *sūtra* on filial piety as found here But the *Avadānaś.* mss. have not *parikared* as is edited here, with no meaning suitable to the context, but *parihared*. The whole sentence I think should be read thus: <yad> *ekenāṁśena putro mātaraṁ dvitīyena pitaraṁ pūrṇavarṣaśataṁ parihared yadvā* etc.

Speyer here advocates an emendation on the basis of an intrinsic difficulty with the text, and a (single) parallel formulation elsewhere. For his part, Shackleton Bailey, in contrast to the certitude of Speyer, wrote with some apparent hesitation: “For *parikared* read *parihared* (T. khur du thogs sam)?”⁴ Although the point may seem a minor one, I

¹ Silk 2007.

² Cowell and Neil 1886: 51.22-23. Tibetan in Derge Kanjur 1, ‘*dul ba, kha*, 5b2, Chinese in T. 1448 (XXIV) 16a20-21 (*juan* 4).

³ Speyer 1902: 109-110.

⁴ Shackleton Bailey 1950: 182. Some trouble was evidently also felt by P. L. Vaidya 1959: 31.23, who without note printed instead *paricaret*. In the glossary, however, p. 538b, he listed *parikaroti* with the definition ‘uphold,’ carrying this over from the glossary of Cowell and Neil apparently without any recognition that the form itself has disappeared from his text. See now Hiraoka 2007: I.114, n. 212, who follows Shackleton Bailey.

believe that important issues are in play here. I would therefore like to reconsider the question, using it as an opportunity to briefly advert to wider issues of text critique in the study of Indian Buddhist literature which deserve fuller treatment.

The passage in question appearing in the *Divyāvadāna* was drawn from the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. The Tibetan parallel in the Vinaya source of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* in the *Vinayavastu* reads our sentence as follows: *bus phrag pa gcig la ni ma bzhas cig shos la ni pha bzhas nas lo brgya tshang bar khur du thogs sam*.⁵ Although he is laconic, Shackleton Bailey appears to be suggesting that we change *parikared* to *parihared* on the basis of the Tibetan *khur du thogs sam*.

Shackleton Bailey's suggestion is complicated by examples from elsewhere in the same *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. In the *Samghabhedavastu*, extant in Sanskrit, we find three cases of the expression *khur du thogs*: 1) *gzhon nu bdag gis ni sa'i rdul ji snyed mchis pa khur du thogs te mch'i'o*, equivalent to Sanskrit *kumāra yāvātī pṛthivyā mṛttikā tām ahaṃ skandhenādāya gacchāmīti*;⁶ 2) *de nas bud med de mu ge'i dus kyi 'chi ba'i 'jigs pas skrag nas rkang lag ma tshang ba'i mi de khur du thogs te grong mthar song nas*, equivalent to *tataḥ sā strī durbhikṣākālamṛtyubhayabhūtā tam hastapādavikālam puruṣaṃ skandhe āropya grāmāntaṃ samavasṛtā*;⁷ 3) a verse following passage 2: *rdum po khur du thogs pa khyod || khyim thab las da mi 'phyo 'am ||*, in Sanskrit *skandhena vahase ruṇḍam idānīm tvaṃ pativratā*.⁸ In all these cases, *khur du thogs* renders forms with *skandha*, shoulder, in the first case with the verb *ā√dā*, in the second with the causative of *ā√ruh*, and in the third with *√vah*.⁹ This would suggest that

In a general defense of his suggestions Shackleton Bailey wrote the following (1950: 167): "As for the emendations on which I have ventured, space does not allow of any discussion; while nearly all of them have the evidence of the *Ḥdul ba* as a *locus standi*, they are all put forward not this ground alone but as intrinsically superior readings in their several contexts." Without implying that any particular instance of his suggestions is consequently unacceptable, I dare to say that in each and every case it is much better—if not indeed essential—to make explicit the grounds for one's changes. If one does not, one leaves the reader to guess, or to take the change on faith. Neither is a good course. Now, there is no question that Shackleton Bailey was an excellent critic (as a Latinist he has been called the best of his generation, and his conjectural emendations brilliant), and most of his ideas are probably good ones. But each must be examined on its own merits, the more so when those merits have nowhere been made clear. Moreover, in light of Shackleton Bailey's general statement of confidence, it is worthwhile wondering about the meaning of his question mark in this particular case.

⁵ Chinese has: 假使有人一肩擔父一肩擔母, 至滿百年.

⁶ Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 11b2; Gnoli 1977-1978: I.86,12-13.

⁷ Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 191b5-6; Gnoli 1977-1978: II.118,17-19.

⁸ Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 192a3; Gnoli 1977-1978: II.118,31.

⁹ In other passages in this Vinaya, it is not possible to compare the text to any extant Sanskrit source. See Derge Kanjur 3 'dul ba, ca 76a7: *bus phrag pa gcig gis ni pha | cig shos kyis ni ma lo brgya tham par yongs su bang ba byas sam* = T. 1442 (XXIII) 642b6 (*juan* 3): 假使其子一肩持母一肩持父, 經於百年, and the same at Derge Kanjur 3 'dul ba, ca 130a3 = T. 1442 (XXIII) 658c16 (*juan* 7): 假使其子左肩擔父右肩擔母, 經於百年. The Tibetan verb *yongs su bang ba* (*byas*) remains unclear to me.

Further examples of the stock phrase in Indic texts extant only in Chinese include T. 203

Shackleton Bailey's suggestion is not necessarily supported by what he apparently provides as evidence, a Tibetan translation equivalent, since other examples in the same text reflect different underlying Indic originals. Elsewhere, however, more supportive parallels do exist.

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* we find the sentence *smān gyi rgyal po | gang gis chos kyi rnam grangs 'di yi ger bris nas glegs bam du byas te | phrag pa la thogs pa des | de bzhin gshegs pa phrag pa la thogs par 'gyur te* rendering *tathāgataṃ bhaiṣajyarāja sa kulaputra aṃsena pariḥarati* | *ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ likhitvā pusta<ka>gataṃ kṛtvā 'msena pariḥareti*.¹⁰ Likewise, later in the same text *de ni de bzhin gshegs pa phrag pa la thogs pa yin no || ma pham pa | gang chos kyi rnam grangs 'di glegs bam du byas shing phrag pa la thogs pa'i* renders *tathāgataṃ so 'msena pariḥareta ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ pusta<ka>gataṃ kṛtvā aṃsena pariḥareta*.¹¹ Here *phrag pa* renders *aṃsa*, 'shoulder', as in the *Pūrṇāvadāna* passage, and *thogs* renders forms of *pari√hr*. In the *Pūrṇāvadāna*, however, it does not appear that *thogs*, the dictionary form of which is *'thogs pa*, 'to carry', has any equivalent in the extant Sanskrit sentence. Rather, in the *Pūrṇāvadāna* the Sanskrit verb appears to be rendered with *bzhag*, a form of *'jog pa*, 'to place'. In a passage from the *Avadānaśataka* with precisely our stock phrase, pointed to by Speyer without reference to its Tibetan translation, we find the same equivalent: *ya ekenāmsena putro mātaraṃ dvitīyena pitaraṃ pūrṇaṃ varṣaśataṃ pariḥared*, rendered in Tibetan *gal te bus pha ma gnyis phrag pa g.yas g.yon du bzhag ste | lo brgya'i bar du khyer ram*.¹² For a further example of the construction with *pari√hr*, we may notice, as I did in my earlier contribution, one passage in the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya* in Pāli: *ekena bhikkhave aṃsena mātaraṃ pariḥareyya ekena aṃsena pitaraṃ pariḥareyya*.¹³

These passages might lead us to conclude that after all Speyer and Shackleton Bailey are right, and that we had best read the anomalous *parikared* as **parihared*. The assumption would then probably be that some phonological (?) error was responsible for the miswriting of the proper *h* as *k*, although this is not a typical error of Nepalese

(IV) 455c22-23; T. 765 (XVII) 682c10-11; T. 970 (XIX) 359a8-9; T. 1412 (XXII) 140c16-17; T. 1545 (XXVII) 535c23-24.

¹⁰ Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 227.8-9; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 216a5-6; Tibetan here and below in Nakamura 1976. In these *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* passages I disregard other sometimes significant variant readings since these do not affect the expression in question.

¹¹ Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 338.4-5; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 324b6-325a1; Gilgit in Watanabe 1975: 124.25-26. An additional case in this text is less clear. Verse 4.56 (Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 119.6-7; Gilgit in Watanabe 1975: 53.32-35; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 120a7-b1 reads:

hasteḥi pādehi śīreṇa cāpi pratipriyaṃ duṣkarakam hi kartum |
śīreṇa aṃsena ca yo dhareta paripūrṇa kalpān yatha gaṅgavālikāḥ ||
mgo dang lag pa dang ni rkang pas kyang || lan du phan par bgyi ba shin tu dka' ||
gang gā'i bye snyed bskal pa rdzogs par yang || mgo dang phrag pa la gang gis khyer ba dang ||

¹² Speyer 1906-1909: 1.205,1-2 (Maitrakanyaka); Derge Kanjur 343 *mdo sde*, *am* 102b3.

¹³ Morris and Hardy 1885-1900: i.61,30-62,1 (II.4.2). Here the Chinese parallel (T. 125 [II] 601a12-14 [juan 11]) has: 若復比丘有人以父著左肩上, 以母著右肩上至千萬.

manuscripts.¹⁴ However one might account for the reading (though account one must—“it’s a mistake” is not an explanation),¹⁵ there is other evidence that may cast doubt on the resolution proposed by Speyer and Shackleton Bailey.

The very same *Divyāvadāna* contains in its chapter on Rūpavatī the following sentence: *āṅkadhātrīty ucyate yā dārakam āṅkena parikarṣayaty āṅkapratyaṅgāni ca saṁsthāpayati*.¹⁶ This story lacks any Tibetan parallel, but the term *āṅkadhātrī* itself is known.¹⁷ Edgerton wrote of the lemma *parikarṣayati*, with citation of this passage: “(= Skt. *parikarṣati*, *carries around*; in Skt. *karṣayati* is used in the sense of *karṣati*) *carries around* (a child, said of a nurse).”¹⁸ In addition, as I cited in my earlier contribution, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* also knows a similar expression, namely *cailoṇḍukam iva śīrasā parikarṣeḥ*, rendered in Tibetan *mgo la thod bzhin du thogs shing*.¹⁹ The meaning of the Sanskrit verb is confirmed here by the commentary, which glosses *dhārayeḥ*.²⁰ This *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* example demonstrates that *parikarṣati* exists alongside *parikarṣayati* in this type of expression.²¹

¹⁴ On the other hand, it is also hard to understand how within either North Indian or Nepalese scripts *re* could be misread for *rṣe*, since in the latter case the *r* would typically be written atop the full form of *ṣe*. (The opposite error, the disappearance of the *r*, would be much more easily accounted for.) A simple phonological confusion is also hard to imagine.

¹⁵ We should also perhaps (re)consider the possibility, even though it might be unlikely and apparently elsewhere unattested, that in fact *parikared* may be a correct reading perhaps, as Edgerton 1953 s.v. *parikarati* suggested, denominative to *parikara* (see Whitney 1889: §1054). But we must remember that being able to justify it grammatically does not mean that it actually existed. In any event, even if one proposes to keep the current reading, or offer another, the choice must somehow be explicitly justified.

¹⁶ Cowell and Neil 1886: 475.13-14. Tokyo University Sanskrit manuscript 955, folio 7b1, has the same reading.

¹⁷ *Mahāvīyutpatti* 9478 (Ishihama and Fukuda 1989) translates it *pang na 'tsho ba'i ma ma*. On the category of nurses, see Hiraoka 2002: 220-221, and 435 n. 29. To his listing of Chinese translations add that in one of the texts corresponding to the *Rūpāvaty-avadāna*, T. 178 (III) 449a26-28, in which four 侍女 are listed: 女主拭其身, 女主沐浴, 女主乳哺, 女主抱之.

¹⁸ Edgerton then goes on to enter under a separate definition a passage from the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 484.11-12), the full verse of which runs as follows:

buddhavaṁśam anudhārayiṣyasi dharmavaṁśa pariśodhayiṣyasi |
saṁghavaṁśa parikarṣayiṣyase ratnasambhavaṁśa bhaviṣyasi ||

Concerning this he writes: “perhaps *attracts, draws to oneself*. . . . Or can the word here mean *you will support, nurse, carry around the Order* (as a nurse carries a child. . .)?” The Tibetan translation (Derge Kanjur 44 *phal chen*, a 301b2-3) has: *sang rgyas rigs ni rjes su 'dzin par 'gyur || chos kyi rigs ni yongs su sbyong par 'gyur || dge 'dun rigs ni yongs su bsud par 'gyur || rin chen 'byung ba'i 'byung gnas khyod 'gyur ro ||*. The Chinese renderings have (T. 278 [IX] 775a16-17 [juan 58]): 守護佛種 姓淨修法種姓 攝取僧種性 了三世種姓, and (T. 279 [X] 426c13-14 [juan 77] = T. 293 [X] 822a1-2 [juan 35]) 汝當持佛種 汝當淨法種 汝能集僧種 三世悉周遍. Both the Tibetan and Chinese translations suggest that Edgerton’s first meaning is closer to the mark in this case.

¹⁹ Wogihara 1932-1935: 943.15-16; Derge Kanjur 12, *shes phyin brgyad stong pa, ka*, 267b7.

²⁰ Wogihara 1932-1935: 961.7.

²¹ It may not even be meaningful to make such a distinction. See Edgerton 1953 (Grammar) §29.4: “Ellipsis or telescoping of the syllable -ay- occurs in optatives from *aya* verbs. . . .” See

So far, I have considered evidence of parallel passages in an attempt to gain an understanding of the possible forms of similar expressions. From a text critical point of view, the purpose of such an exercise is to define the scope of possible idioms or expressions, thereby strengthening the case for a possible change of the printed text. But the way in which we speak of such a procedure and the terminology we use is often imprecise, and this imprecision contributes to a lack of clarity regarding the goals and limitations of the process itself. Classical text critics often speak of ‘emendation’ and ‘conjectural emendation.’ As Emanuel Tov argues in his survey of text critical studies of Biblical materials, however, it is clearer to speak of a difference between ‘preference’ and ‘emendation’²² The former term he presents as referring to the choice of an attested reading, while the latter points to an unsupported and therefore imaginary option not attested in any source. If we accept a comparison between the way a Tibetan translation is related to an Indic text and the way the Septuagint is related to the (it would be more cautious to write ‘the’) Hebrew text of the Bible, then we must think of its evidence as supplying ‘readings.’ That is, a Tibetan translation may be ‘retroverted’ into Sanskrit, and the status of such a retroverted reading is equivalent to any other reading found in, for example, a manuscript. The choice between such readings is one of ‘preference,’ rather than a choice between (attested) ‘reading’ and (imaginary) ‘emendation’. Here, therefore, ‘retroversion’ refers to the postulation of an underlying original which a given translation represents.²³ The question then becomes, first, whether a given reading in a Tibetan translation justifies a given retroversion, and second, whether such a retroverted reading is preferable to other available readings.

The most basic editorial goal must always be the establishment of the text intended by its author. Consequently, only if we imagine the original and ultimate bases of two texts to have been different are we freed from the obligation of harmonizing their variant readings. If a certain retroverted reading [A] is related to readings we find in our manuscript(s), even through a chain of corruptions and mistakes, then reading [A] presents another choice between which we might choose (a ‘preference’) in our quest to establish the ‘original’ text.²⁴ Likewise, it might suggest an as-yet unattested reading (an ‘emendation’) which, nevertheless, the critic may postulate to have been responsible for the generation of the corrupt extant readings (including the retroverted reading). In these terms, what Shackleton Bailey speaks of as ‘emendations’ based on the Tibetan translations of Vinaya texts may in almost all cases more clearly be termed *retroverted readings* for which he expresses his *preference*. His claim, implicit though it may be, is that the Tibetan translation reflects a form of the Indic text which can be recovered, and that the recovered or retroverted Indic text belongs to the same lineage (recension, “text”) as the extant, though perhaps corrupt, Sanskrit text under investigation. The key

also §38.27.

²² See Tov 1992: 351-369.

²³ For a detailed discussion, see Tov 1997 passim.

²⁴ This is a process in which we must engage even though we know we will never actually succeed beyond doubt in recovering an original form of the text.

questions, then, have been and remain, first, whether we can assert with confidence that a given Tibetan form represents a given Sanskrit form (that is, whether a specific retroversion is justified), and second, whether such a retroverted form, even if justified, belongs to the same textual unit as does the extant text, or whether it might rather represent a different version of the Indic text.

To apply a retroversion as a relevant reading requires the assumption of a single textual line standing behind both extant sources. If we wish to claim that a form we find in Tibetan and retrovert into Sanskrit is a ‘reading,’ we must attempt—even if we cannot fully succeed—to explain its relation to the extant text. But this immediately raises the question of what the extant text is. And in the present case, this introduces yet another problem.

The *Divyāvadāna* is one of the earliest Buddhist Sanskrit texts edited in modern times, and its editors reported few of the variants in their Nepalese sources. (In fact, this is probably true of most Indian Buddhist texts so far edited: the selection of the sources, the reporting of their readings, and the explicit expression of the criteria for preference of one reading over another are all often ‘sub-optimal.’) How much does this matter, from a practical point of view? The answer is, we don’t really know. Sometimes perhaps not much.²⁵ But few modern scholars have thought it worthwhile to go back to the manuscripts, a rather surprising stance to take when one’s task is avowedly one of text criticism. But when we do take that journey back to the sources, we are in for a surprise.

What did the editors of the *Divyāvadāna* have before them in their manuscripts of our passage? Leaving aside all issues other than that of the verb under discussion here, we find that the situation is far from clear. The manuscripts called by the editors E, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and D (which they call “very correct”), in the Société Asiatique, both indeed read *parikared*.²⁶ However, the editors’ manuscript F, as well as two manuscripts in Tokyo University Library, very clearly read here something entirely different, namely *parikehaled*, a form beyond my understanding.²⁷ How this

²⁵ In my study of a portion of the *Dharmarūcy-avadāna*, for which I was able to compare the Nepalese tradition recorded in the 1886 edition of Cowell and Neil with the text found in centuries earlier Gilgit manuscripts, I discovered less variation between the traditions than I expected, although Cowell and Neil’s text can be corrected in numerous instances. See Silk Forthcoming.

Hiraoka 2007 as Appendix A to his complete translation of Cowell and Neil’s *Divyāvadāna* (II.*1-32) offers an extensive list of suggested readings (he calls them ‘corrections,’ *teisei* 訂正) at what looks at a quick glance to be a rate of perhaps 2 to 3 per page of the Cowell and Neil edition. In many but not all cases he discusses the suggestions in the notes to his translation, usually with reference to Tibetan and Chinese translations.

²⁶ Paris 53, folio 31b4, Société Asiatique 5, folio 25a6. I am extremely grateful to the kindness of Vincent Tournier, who checked the Bibliothèque Nationale and Société Asiatique manuscripts for me. The editors note (p. vi) that they did not use MS E beyond the first few pages. In referring to another MS in Cambridge dated by Bendall to the 14th-15th century, they record its variants but for the passage in question (Cowell and Neil 1886: 661) they list no relevant reading (implying that it agrees with the printed edition?).

²⁷ Paris 56, folio 21a7; Tokyo 170, folio 33b7, 171 folio 26a6 (= 47a6 in the continuous

might be related to either *parikared*, **parikarṣed* or **parihared* is not clear. Moreover, the editors state that all of the manuscripts they were able to use are “only modern copies, made with more or less care from one original, which is now in the possession of Pandit Indrānand of Patan, Nepal,” a manuscript, they report, dated by Bendall to the 17th century.²⁸ Is this manuscript the archetype of the copies of the *Divyāvadāna* in European and Japanese libraries? We are fortunate that this very manuscript was filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. Dr. Kengo Harimoto writes to me the following:²⁹

Among the paper MSS of the *Divyāvadāna*[*mālā*], the only MS available to us in electronic form (A 123/6) reads *parikared* (folio 25a7). It so happens that this manuscript (NGMPP reel A 123/6, National Archives Kathmandu acc. no. 3/295) is most likely the one once seen by Bendall. The size, the number of folios, material, number of lines on each side, and most of all, the beginning and the end of two folios mentioned in the preface to Cowell and Neil 1886 p. vii match that of our digital photograph DSCN0099.JPG. Having said that, I am very skeptical that this manuscript was the source of all the other MSS Cowell and Neil used. In light of the number of MSS of the *Divyāvadānamālā* microfilmed by the NGMPP (about 15), I would be very much surprised if all five MSS that Cowell and Neil used derived from a 17th century (rather late) paper MS, which is A 123/6.

Cowell and Neil must have been aware of manuscripts with the reading *parikehaled*, yet they printed (without notice of variant) the reading *parikared*. Since they view all their sources as based on a single archetype, they must have believed that the former reading is a corruption of the latter. Since they do not even record the reading *parikehaled*, they naturally do not explain how it might be a corruption of *parikared*.³⁰ From this point of view, it is irrelevant whether the manuscript NGMPP A 123/6, which indeed also reads *parikared*, really is the archetype of Cowell and Neil's manuscripts. If we understand Shackleton Bailey to be suggesting a retroversion from Tibetan of **parihared*, his suggestion must be that the form Cowell and Neil printed in their edition, *parikared*, represents a corruption of this **parihared*. In light of his statement that “nearly all of [his suggestions] have the evidence of the *Ḥdul ba* as a *locus standi*,” unless this case is an exception it would appear that it is upon this basis

numbering of the manuscript).

²⁸ Cowell and Neil 1886: vi-vii.

²⁹ I am very grateful for the kind assistance Dr. Harimoto provided me via email on 29 January, 2008. Regarding the name of the work in question, it appears that an older title *Divyāvadānamālā* was later shortened to *Divyāvadāna*. For a detailed discussion, see Hiraoka 2002: 19-23, with notes on p. 406. Commenting on how the NGMPP records list their manuscripts, Harimoto confirms Hiraoka's observation: “Seeing the way they are listed (almost all of them as the *Divyāvadānamālā*), it appears that there was a notion among the pandits in Nepal that the text is called the *Divyāvadānamālā*.”

³⁰ In fact, they almost never justify their editorial choices, save in a few notes on pp. 703-712 with, *inter alia*, one or two text-critical observations.

that he is expressing his preference for the retroverted reading **parihared* over *parikared*. Or is he indeed suggesting an emendation—what he might have termed a conjectural emendation? But if he is not offering a retroverted reading but an emendation, why does he bother to cite a Tibetan equivalent at all? (And this still leaves the question, why his question mark? Of what is he unsure?) For Speyer the issue of retroversion or possible readings does not arise; he is plainly suggesting a conjectural emendation based on a (single) parallel construction known to him.

The evidence introduced above suggests that while the meaning of the stock expression of respect for parents through the metaphor that one “carries mother/father on one’s shoulders for one hundred years” is not in dispute, *pace* the apparent stance of Speyer and Shackleton Bailey, the linguistic expression of this phrase is not invariant. There exists alongside *pari√hṛ* a similar idiom with *pari√kṛṣ*, construed with the accusative of what is carried and the instrumental of that upon which the carrying is done, both verbs conveying a close if not synonymous sense. It is possible that the form with *pari√hṛ* is more common, though with so few examples it is difficult to judge and, in any case, even if more common, it is not necessarily consequently more likely in any given case. To accept Shackleton Bailey’s change in the example in question from the *Pūrṇāvadāna* as a ‘preference’, that is, to accept that his suggestion has the status of a ‘reading’ supported by the Tibetan translation he cites, would require us to ignore the evidence that the same Tibetan construction elsewhere, even in the very same text, reflects quite different Indic underlying constructions. Shackleton Bailey cannot be right for the reason he apparently adduces: the Tibetan translation of the Vinaya source of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* does not seem to allow us to confidently retrovert a reading of **parihared* in the passage in question. But Shackleton Bailey might still be right; it is still possible that we should *emend* the reading *parikared* to **parihared*, as explicitly suggested by Speyer. But in this case, we cannot do so based on the evidence of the Tibetan translation, and must rely instead on parallel formulations or on some other as yet unstated grounds (and even the so-called intrinsically better reading is better for some reason[s]). When we move from the realm of retroverted readings, which require of an editor the expression of a *preference* for one firmly established reading over another, to the realm of *conjectural emendations*—emendations proper—we enter the realm of imagination. Further evidence might still clarify the matter but, as it stands, it must be admitted that both my suggested emendation and that of Shackleton Bailey (and of course also Speyer) are emendations, not preferences for attested readings, and equally lack clear and unequivocal support in the sources.

A final lesson here is that the textual history and actual shape of the *Divyāvadāna* (if that is even the proper name for this collection of stories!) is rather more complex than it has heretofore appeared. There is surely much more to be learned, as soon as we stop simply believing authorities, even generally reliable ones, and begin to think and to dig for ourselves.

Literature

- Cowell, Edward Byles, and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977-1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sanghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 49/1-2 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2002. *Setsuwa no kōkogaku: Indo bukkō setsuwa ni himerareta shisō* 説話の考古学: インド仏教説話に秘められた思想 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).
- . 2007. *Budda ga nazo toku sanze no monogatari: Diviya Avadāna zenyaku* ブッダが迷い解く三世の物語 『ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ』全訳. 2 Vols. (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).
- Ishihama Yumiko and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989 *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvūtpatti*. Studia Tibetica 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko).
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Morris, Richard, and Edmund Hardy. 1885–1900. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*. Second Edition, revised by A. K. Warder (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint: 1961).
- Nakamura Zuiryū 中村瑞隆. 1976-. “Chibetto-yaku Hokekyō” チベット訳法華經. *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 2 onward. Page numbers equal those of Kern and Nanjio 1908-1912.
- Shackleton Bailey, D[avid] R[oy]. 1950. “Notes on the Divyāvadāna: Part I.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1950/3-4: 166-84.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2007. “Bauddhavaṇa: Notes on Buddhist Vocabulary.” *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō / Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 10: 171-179.
- . Forthcoming. “The Story of Dharmaruci: In Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* and Its Source the *Divyāvadāna*.”
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1902. “Critical Remarks on the Text of Divyāvadāna.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 16: 103-130.
- . 1906-1909. *Avadānaśataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint The Hague: Mouton, 1958).
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, and Hokei Idzumi. 1949. *The Gandavyūha Sūtra* (Kyoto: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World. Originally published 1934).
- Toda, Hirofumi. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text* (Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center).
- Tov, Emanuel. 1992. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press/Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum).
- . 1997. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3 (Jerusalem: Simor).
- Vaidya, P. L. *Divyāvadānam*. 1959. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 20 (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute).
- Watanabe, Shoko. 1975. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*. Part Two: Romanized Text (Tokyo: The Reiyukai).
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1889. *A Sanskrit Grammar: including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken 2. Second (revised and extended) edition (Boston: Ginn & Company / Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel).
- Wogihara Unrai. 1932-1935. *Abhisamayālamkāraḥ Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973).

* At the very last moment, while this article was in the proof stage, I came across a possible example of h/k confusion in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, in the expression printed by Pradhan (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8 [Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1975]: 218.13-14) *nāham evam ahārṣam*. As Funahashi Issai (舟橋一哉, *Kusharon no Genten Kaimei Gobon* 俱舍論の原典解明 業品 [Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1987]: 192 n. 1) points out (cf. Tib. *ma byas so*, Chn. 不作), the verb is to be read *akārṣam*. Without access to the manuscript, I do not know whether this represents a misprint of Pradhan's or a genuine reading. Since the expression *nāham evam akārṣam* has interesting implications for an outstanding problem in *Dhammapada* 306 and its parallels, I will discuss it separately.